

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of JENNIFER ELAYNE KURAS,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ROBERT MICHAEL ADKINSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JAYMIE ANN KURAS,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of JENNIFER ELAYNE KURAS,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JAYMIE ANN KURAS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ROBERT MICHAEL ADKINSON,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
April 22, 2004

No. 251250  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 91-294805

No. 251364  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 91-294805

Before: Cavanagh, P.J., and Murphy and Smolenski, JJ.

## MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from the trial court's termination of their parental rights. The trial court based its termination of respondent-father's parental rights on MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j), while its termination of respondent-mother's parental rights was pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i), (j) and (m). These cases are being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that statutory grounds for termination were proven by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The original petition for permanent custody, filed five days after the child's birth, alleged that respondent-mother suffered from schizophrenia and bi-polar disorder and had a long history of mental illness with involuntary commitments in mental institutions. She had previously relinquished her parental rights to three children and had her rights to two other children terminated by court order for reasons including neglect, abuse, inability to protect, and mental illness. Although the petition in this case was for permanent custody, respondent-mother was allowed supervised visitations. But after one month, these visitations were temporarily suspended because of her inappropriate and disruptive behavior. Based on this evidence, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that subsections (i) and (m) were established by proof of the respondent-mother's prior terminations. We also find that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that there was no reasonable expectation that respondent-mother would be able to properly parent the child within a reasonable time given the child's age, and that there was a reasonable likelihood of harm to the child if she was returned to the home of respondent-mother.

Regarding respondent-father, whose paternity was established during the pendency of this case, he initially claimed to be unable to plan for the child for a number of reasons, including a lack of independent income and medical insurance, as well as health problems caused by Hepatitis C. Respondent-father reiterated his inability to plan for the child a few months later when the foster care worker discussed a treatment plan with him. He based this inability upon two medical conditions and added that the child should be placed for adoption. This undisputed evidence undercuts the argument made by respondent-father that he was not provided an opportunity to plan for the child.

Additionally, respondents only form of housing was a boarding house in which six other adults lived, respondent-father had no independent source of income, had not obtained prenatal care for the minor child and had no baby supplies at the time the child was born. Therefore, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in finding there was no reasonable expectation that the respondent-father would be able to properly parent the minor child within a reasonable time considering the child's age, and that there existed a reasonable likelihood of harm to the child should she be returned to respondent-father's home.

Finally, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of both respondents' parental rights was not contrary to the child's best interests since there was no evidence that

either parent had established a significant presence in the child's life and in light of the risk of harm to the infant caused by their health issues and lack of parenting skills.

Affirmed.

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh  
/s/ William B. Murphy  
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski